



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,876	07/11/2001	William S. Somers	37174/9	9624
26161	7590	05/04/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			PAK, MICHAEL D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1646	

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MAILED
MAY 04 2006
GROUP 1600

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/903,876
Filing Date: July 11, 2001
Appellant(s): SOMERS ET AL.

Allyson R. Hatton
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed November 4, 2005 appealing from the Office action mailed February 8, 2005.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is substantially correct. The changes are as follows.

The rejection of claims 8, 12 and 13 under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter is withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 7-13, 16 and 17 under 35 USC 112 paragraph one because the claimed invention is directed to new matter is withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 7-13, 16 and 17 under 35 USC 103 because the claimed invention is directed to obvious invention is withdrawn.

Claims 8, 12 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

No amendment after final has been filed.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is substantially correct. The changes are as follows.

The rejection of claims 8, 12 and 13 under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter is withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 7-13, 16 and 17 under 35 USC 112 paragraph one because the claimed invention is directed to new matter is withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 7-13, 16 and 17 under 35 USC 103 because the claimed invention is directed to obvious invention is withdrawn.

Claims 7, 9-11, 16 and 17 remains rejected under 35 USC 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

Trilateral Project WM4 Comparative Studies in New Technologies: Report on Comparative Study on Protein 3-Dimensional (3-D) Structure Related Claims.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 7, 9-11, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims are drawn to a method of using computer algorithm which is non statutory because claims are drawn to abstract ideas without practical application that is tangible.

(10) Response to Argument

Response to arguments regarding rejection of claims 7, 9-11, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Appellants argue that the subject matter covered by the claims satisfies the utility requirement because of the trilateral report indicates that screening method have utility. However, the rejection is based upon 35 USC 101 rejection because the claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter and not because a rejection based upon lack of the utility requirements. Appellants arguments do not address the 35 USC 101 rejection based upon non-statutory subject matter. Rather appellants argue support for utility requirement based upon the trilateral report. The arguments regarding the support for utility requirement because of the trilateral report is a different issue from the rejection of

Art Unit: 1646

claims because the invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The rejected claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter because the methods do not require a tangible step and the method is performed in the abstract such as a computer visualization of the crystal structure. Unlike the rejected claims, claims 8, 12 and 13 include the term "contacting the agent" which can be a computer simulation of a crystal structure of estrogen receptor contacting with the structure of the agent ligand. Although methods of claims 8, 12 and 13 may be performed entirely in a computer simulation of the crystal structure, the act of "contacting" provides the interaction of computer simulations. However, the rejected claims are entirely drawn to providing crystal structure in the abstract whether it is in the computer, paper or other forms of providing an abstract crystal structure.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Pak



**MICHAEL PAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Conferees:

Brenda Brumback

Art Unit: 1646

Ardin Marschel

Ardin H. Marschel 4/15/06
ARDIN H. MARSCHEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Brenda Brumback
BRENDA BRUMBACK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600